REMARKS

The Applicant hereby traverses the rejections of record, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of such in light of the remarks contained herein. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 9-13, 15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,625,144 to El-Batal et al. (hereinafter "El-Batal").

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *citing Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 1 recites storing the identified information [intended for the user device] in a buffer as first stored information. In the Current Action, the Examiner claims that El-Batal satisfies this limitation in stating that "UART's inherently have up to 16 byte buffers." (*see* the Current Action, pg. 3). However, the Applicant respectfully submits that El-Batal does not teach or suggest this limitation. Even if all UART's inherently have up to 16 byte buffers as the Examiner suggests, which the Applicant does not concede as true, there is no suggestion that any buffers that may be present within the UART's of El-Batal store identified information [intended for the user device] as first stored information. Rather, El-Batal describes UART's as a circuitry component to support controller functions, such as a controller-to-controller serial communication. For example, El-Batal discloses "standard UART serial communication processes can be used to send any message between controllers." (*see* El-Batal col. 5, lines 52-54). Moreover, the Applicant believes storing the identified information [intended for the user device] in a buffer as first stored information is not inherent within the disclosure of El-Batal as UART's are described as facilitating communication only between controllers and are not described as storing any information.

Claim 1 also recites communicating the first stored information via the low bandwidth interface to the user device. In the Current Action, the Examiner indicates this limitation is satisfied by El-Batal at Figs. 5-7. Specifically, the Examiner asserts "the UART communicates with host computer 102 via RS-232 (Fig. 5) via the low bandwidth DB9 Conn." (*see* the Current Action, pg. 3). However, the Applicant respectfully submits El-Batal does not teach this limitation. Specifically, as the Applicant best understands, fig. 5 represents a connection between two controllers. Also, reference to figs. 6 & 7 makes clear that a UART does not communicate with a CPU via low bandwidth DB9. As shown, El-Batal does not teach every limitation of the Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and thus inherit all limitation from claim 1. Claims 2-4 each recite limitations not taught by El-Batal. Claims 2-4 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claim 9 recites "wherein the microprocessor is disposed to arbitrate access to the FC system to communicate information received from the low bandwidth interface when an amount of received information exceeds a predetermined value." In the Current Action, the Examiner states that El-Batal satisfies this limitation at Figs. 5-7. Specifically, the Examiner states "the UART communicates with host computer 102 via RS-232 (Fig. 5) via the low bandwidth DB9 Conn." (*see* the Current Action, pg. 5). However, the Applicant respectfully submits El-Batal does not teach this limitation. Specifically, as the Applicant best understands, fig. 5 represents a connection between two controllers. Also, reference to figs. 6 & 7 makes clear that a UART does not communicate with a CPU via low bandwidth DB9. As shown, El-Batal does not teach every limitation of the Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 10-13 and 15 depend from claim 9 and thus inherit all limitations from claim 9. Claims 10-13 each recite limitations not taught by El-Batal. Claims 10-13 and 15 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 9. Therefore, the

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claim 17 recites wherein the microprocessor is disposed to arbitrate access to at least one of the first and second Fibre Channel arbitrated loop topologies to communicate information received from the low bandwidth interface. In the Current Action, the Examiner states that El-Batal satisfies this limitation at Figs. 5-7. Specifically, the Examiner states "the UART communicates with host computer 102 via RS-232 (Fig. 5) via the low bandwidth DB9 Conn." (*see* the Current Action, pg. 5). However, the Applicant respectfully submits El-Batal does not teach this limitation. Specifically, as the Applicant best understands, fig. 5 represents a connection between two controllers. Also, reference to figs. 6 & 7 makes clear that a UART does not communicate with a CPU via low bandwidth DB9. As shown, El-Batal does not teach every limitation of the Applicant's claimed invention. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17 and thus inherit all limitations from claim 17. Claims 18-20 each recite limitations not taught by El-Batal. Claims 18-20 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of record.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5-8, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over El-Batal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,276 to Hunt et al. (hereinafter "Hunt").

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P.

§ 2143. Without admitting that the first or second criteria is satisfied, the Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of El-Batal and Hunt fails to satisfy the third criteria.

Claims 5-8, which depend from claim 1, each recite storing the identified information [intended for the user device] in a buffer as first stored information. As shown above with respect to claim 1, El-Batal fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Moreover, Hunt is not relied upon to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, the combination of El-Batal and Hunt fails to comport with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record.

Claims 14 and 16, which depend from claim 9, each recite "wherein the microprocessor is disposed to arbitrate access to the FC system to communicate information received from the low bandwidth interface when an amount of received information exceeds a predetermined value." As shown above with respect to claim 9, El-Batal fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Moreover, Hunt is not relied upon to teach or suggest this limitation. Thus, the combination of El-Batal and Hunt fails to comport with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-2025, under Order No. 10002385-1 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as Express Mail, Airbill No. EV629197478US in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date of Deposit: November 9, 2005

Typed Name: Laura Horton

Signature: _____

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Michael J. Fogarty, III
Reg. No.: 42,544
Date: November 9, 2005
Telephone No. (214) 855-8172